| | į, | | į | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|
| | 1 | STEPHEN P. SWINTON (106398) J. CHRISTOPHER JACZKO (149317) | | | |
| | 2 | COOLEY GODWARD LLP 4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100 | · | | |
| | 3 | San Diego, California 92121-2128 Telephone: (858) 550-6000 | | | |
| | 4 | Facsimile: (858) 453-3555 | | | |
| | 5 | DOUGLAS E. OLSON (38649) BROBECK PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP | | | |
| | 6 | 12390 El Camino Real San Diego, California 92130 | } | | |
| | 7 | Telephone: (858) 720-2500 Facsimile: (858) 720-2555 | | | |
| | 8 | R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR. (102178) | | | |
| | 9 | GEN-PROBE, INC. 10210 Genetic Center Drive | | | |
| | 10 | San Diego, California 92121-4362 Telephone: (858) 410-8918 | | | |
| | 11 | Facsimile: (858) 410-8637 | ` | | |
| į | 12 13 14 015 | Attorneys for Plaintiff GEN-PROBE, INCORPORATED | 9.4 | | |
| | 13 | | | | |
| | 414 4 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | |
| | C 15 | SOUTHERN DIS | TRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| | ≈ 16 | | • | | |
| | TU17 | GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED, | No. 99CV2668H AJB Judge Marilyn L. Huff | | |
| | ⊨₌ TJ18 | Plaintiff, | SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS | | |
| | <u>-</u> 19 | v. | IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL | | |
| | 20 | VYSIS, INC., | SUMMARY JUDGMENT | | |
| | 21 | Defendant. | DATE: May 29, 2001 TIME: 10:30 a.m. | | |
| | 22 | | DEPT.: Courtroom 1 | | |
| | 23 | | | | |
| | 24 | | • | | |
| | 25 | Plaintiff Gen-Probe, Incorporated | respectfully submits the following statement of | | |
| | 26 | li de la companya de | rences to supporting evidence, in support of its motion | | |
|) | 27 | for partial summary judgment. | | | |
| | 28 | 111 | | | |
| | | | | | |

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO
282782 v1/SD
627201!.DOC

| 1 | UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS: | Supporting Evidence: |
|----------------|---|---|
| 2 | 1. United States Patent No. 5,750,338 (the '338 | 338 Patent, Exhibit 8 ¹ |
| 3 | patent) consists of the specification, including | |
| 4 | drawings, and the claims. The '338 patent | |
| 5 | contains six independent claims (claims 1, 7, | |
| 6 | 19, 27, 28 and 34). Each of these claims is | |
| 7 | generally directed to a method of, or a kit for, | |
| 8 | amplifying and/or detecting a target | |
| 9 | polynucleotide (i.e., a nucleic acid), wherein the | |
| 10 | target is first isolated on a support. | |
| 11 C | 2. Each of the claims contains a step of | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8 at col. 32, 11. 27 to 32, |
| 12 U | "amplifying" the target polynucleotide or | (emphasis added). |
| 13 U | sample. For example, claim 1 provides: | |
| | 1. A method for amplifying a target polynucleotide contained in a sample comprising the steps of: | • |
| 16 17 18 | (a) contacting the sample with a first support which binds to the target polynucleotide; | |
| □ ∏9 | (b) substantially separating the support and bound target | |
| 20 | polynucleotide from the sample; | |
| 21 22 | (c) <u>amplifying</u> the target polynucleotide. | |
| 23 | 3. The '338 patent specification sets forth | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at col. 30, 11. 14-18, |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | 1 |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | whibits shall refer to the exhibits attached to the |
| | | KNIDILS SHAII ICICI TO THE CAMBING ACTORNICE TO THE |

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all references to Exhibits shall refer to the exhibits attached to the Notice of Lodgment of Exhibits filed concurrently herewith.

COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

282782 v1/SD 627201!.DOC

| 1 | Undisputed Material Facts: | SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: |
|---|---|--|
| 2 | 5. The '338 patent specification sets forth four | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at col. 30, ll. 44-45. |
| 3 | examples of the amplification methods | |
| 4 | contemplated by the inventors (Examples 4-7). | |
| 5 | Consistent with the teaching of the patent that | |
| 6 | sequence-specific primers and specific enzymes | |
| 7 | are not necessary, each example suggests and | |
| 8 | describes amplification methods that use only | · |
| 9 10 | non-specific primers and enzymes. | 1 20 1 50 4 1 |
| 11 | 6. Example 4 illustrates "the use of RNA | |
| 1 | polymerase to amplify target DNA." It | 31, 1. 17. |
| 12 3 4 55 13 13 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 | describes a method for amplifying the capture | |
| W ³ | DNA by non-specific amplification using | |
| | polymerases that lack transcriptional specificity. | |
| | 7. Example 4 discloses only non-specific | Lawrie Depo., Exhibit 9 at 231:7-13, emphasis |
| 16 2 | amplification: | added. |
| [47 | 8. Example 5 describes a non-specific | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at col. 31, l. 24-54, |
| 118 119 | amplification method in which the target DNA | emphasis added. |
| 20 | is replicated using random (i.e., non-specific) | • |
| 21 | primers and non-specific transcription of that | |
| 22 | DNA into RNA: | |
| 23 | In this example, both non-specific | |
| 24 | replication of target DNA and transcription of that DNA are used to | |
| 25 | amplify capture target DNA Because the primers are random, | |
| | some will, simple (sic) as a matter of | |
| 26 | statistics, bind to and cause replication of sample sequences, no | |
| 27 | matter what those sequences are | |
| 28 | | |

COOLEY GODWARD LLP

SAN DIEGO

| 1 | Undisputed Mäteriae Facts: | SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 2 | 9. Example 5 discloses only non-specific | Lawrie Depo., Exhibit 9, at 231:14-16; Richards |
| 3 | amplification. | Depo., Exhibit 10, at 139:23 – 140:3. |
| 4 | 10. Example 6 describes replication of target | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at col. 31, l. 3 to col. 32, |
| 5 | DNA using DNA polymerase and random | 1. 19. |
| 6 | hexamer oligonucleotides "to bring about | |
| 7 | non-specific double-stranded DNA synthesis" | |
| 8 | using a series of repeated heat denaturation and | |
| 9 | enzyme replacement steps | |
| 10 | 11. Example 6 discloses only non-specific | Lawrie Depo., Exhibit 9, at 231:17-19; Richards |
| 11 | amplification. | Depo., Exhibit 10, at 140:9-13. |
| | 12. Example 7 describes non-specific | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at col. 32, l. 10-19. |
| 2 3 4 5 | amplification using an RNA polymerase, QB | |
| 14 05 | replicase: | |
| 16 0 10 117 | In this example, rRNA and RNA transcribed from target DNA is purified using a capture probe, | |
| ⊨ ∏18 | described above. The hybrid duplex is then denatured and single stranded | |
| □ ∏19 | nucleic acids are then replicated non- specifically using QB replicase | |
| 20 | 13. Example 7 discloses only nonspecific | Lawrie Depo., Exhibit 9, at 231:20-22; |
| 21 | amplification. | Richards Depo., Exhibit 10, at 141: 3-7. |
| 22 | 14. The first pages of the '338 patent provide | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8. |
| 23 | drawings of various methods encompassed by | |
| 24 | the invention. | |
| 25 | 15. The first 3 drawings (Figure 1a to Figure 3) | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8. |
| 26 | depict target capture methods alone, without | |
| 27 | amplification. | |
| 28 | | |

COOLEY GODWARD LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN DIEGO

282782 v1/SD 627201!.DOC

| Undisputed Material Facts: | SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: |
|---|--|
| 16. Figures 4, 5 and 6 depict target capture | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8. |
| followed by amplification using only non- | |
| specific primers or enzymes. | |
| 17. The drawings included in the patent are | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8, at cols. 10 - 19. |
| discussed and described in the text of the patent | |
| specification | |
| 18. The text of the specification expressly | '338 Patent, Exhibit 8. at col. 15, 11. 56-58, |
| states that in each of the drawings that include | emphasis added. |
| amplification (Figures, 4, 5 and 6) "the isolated | · |
| target is non-specifically amplified to form a | 2.4 |
| multitude of amplification products." | |
| 19. One of ordinary skill in the art would have | Falkinham Declaration at ¶¶ 5 - 52. |
| understood the term "amplifying" in the '338 | , |
| patent to include only the non-specific | |
| amplification methods taught by the patent. | |
| 20. One of ordinary skill in the art would not | Falkinham Declaration at ¶ 5. |
| have understood the term "amplifying" to | |
| include other amplification methods that use | |
| sequence-specific primers or enzymes. | a ii |
| 21. The PCR method was first described at a | |
| scientific meeting in the summer of 1985 and | |
| was published in December 20, 1985. | site analysis for diagnosis of sickle cell |
| | anemia," SCIENCE 230:1350-54 (1985). |
| 22. Within the scientific community, PCR was | Richards Depo, Exhibit 10, at 38:6-8. |
| immediately "big news." | |

| 1 | Undisputed Material Facts: | SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: |
|----------------------|--|--|
| 2 | 23. The patent was meant to cover new | Lawrie Depo., Exhibit 9, at 178:19 - 180:11; |
| 3 | amplification methods using non-specific | 180:23 – 181:13. |
| 4 | primers, not already-known methods such as | |
| 5 | PCR. | |
| 6 | 24. On December 15, 1989, Dr. James C. | Exhibit 1 |
| 7 | Richards, the Director of Business Development | |
| 8 | and Licensing for Gene-Trak Systems, admitted | |
| 9 | that the '338 patent encompassed only | |
| 10 | amplification with non-specific primers and | |
| 11 | explicitly contrasted the methods of the patent | |
| 12 13 14 14 | with other methods of amplification using | |
| 413 W | specific primers. Dr. Richards' analysis was set | |
| Ш4 <u>Ф</u> | forth in a letter to one of Gene-Trak's partners, | |
| 口5 の | Amoco Technology Company. | |
| ₌ 16 | 25. Dr. Richards first discussed the fact that the | Exhibit 1 at p. 2 (emphasis in original). |
| C17 | pending patent application encompassed the use | |
| | of random, non-specific primers. He then | |
| 다9 지 3 2 2 | discussed the effect of combining non-specific | |
| 20 | amplification with the use of an initial target | |
| 21 | capture step. Finally, he pointedly contrasted | |
| 22 | the invented method with other known methods | 1 |
| 23 | that used specific primers or promoters (e.g. | , |
| 24 | enzymes): | |
| 25 | Cetus, Sibia/Salk, Biotechnica, etc. | |
| 26 | all claim specific primers for amplification whereas the present | |
| 27 28 | invention claims uses of the opposite, namely, non-specific | |
| 28 | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 00CV2668H A.IR |

COOLEY GODWARD LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN DIEGO

282782 v1/SD 627201!.DOC

| U | NDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS: | SUPPORTING EVIDENCE: |
|------|--|---|
| | primer or promoters Following extensive washing, captured target polynucleotides could be released | |
| | and the non-specific amplification process could take place. | |
| 2 | 6. Gen-Probe's HIV-1/HCV Assay use a | Longiaru Declaration at ¶ 5. |
| l ta | arget-specific amplification technology called | |
| T | ranscription-Mediated Amplification (TMA). | · |
| 2 | 7. TMA uses specific primers, specific | Longiaru Declaration at ¶¶ 6-11. |
| p | promoters, and a specific polymerase enzyme | · |
| t | hat recognizes only those promoters. | |
| 2 | 28. Gen-Probe's product does not use | Longiaru Declaration at ¶¶ 6-11. |
| r | non-specific amplification. | |
| I | Dated. April 30, 2001 | STEPHEN P. SWINTON J. CHRISTOPHER JACZKO COOLEY GODWARD LLP |
| | • | DOUGLAS E. OLSON BROBECK PHLEGER & HARRISON LLP |
| | | R. WILLIAM BOWEN, JR. GEN-PROBE, INC. |

Attorneys for Plaintiff GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED

26 27

20

21

22

23

24

25

28

COOLEY GODWARD LLP 282782 v1/SD ATTORNEYS AT LAW 627201!.DOC SAN DIEGO